



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## II.—DERIVATIVES OF THE ROOT *bhǎ(y)*- 'TO STRIKE; BIND'.

1. To announce that one and the same root exhibits nearly opposite meanings, virtual countersenses, is likely again to provoke the hostility of surprise. Not a few times before now (e. g. in AJP. 26, 177, 183, 185, 189, 194, 202; TAPA. 37, 8 [41, 33 peg> <tie]; JAOS. 27, 412-413; Cl. Quart. 1, 19) I have commented on the contrast groups split> <splice and stick (i. e. pierce)> <stitch, and so far as the semantic problem broached has provoked comment the comment has taken the form of the easy, impatient sneer of those who do not take the trouble to read, much less to weigh, evidence. The evidence for this contrast association-group<sup>1</sup> is, however, irrefragable, and I return to a question I raised long ago, viz: Whether metaphor is not the permanent factor in Language (Cl. Rev. 13, 400). This problem I begin to conceive almost physiologically, and I ask myself whether, when the generations of neolithic man had conceived of sewing as a pierce-bind process, there was not some physiological record of this conception left behind in the brain convolutions, a record transmitted to a bronze age posterity, transmissible since to all the sons of men. And yet there is no need to materialize the metaphor, for stitching has always remained a pierce-bind process. But I do not mean now to marshall the evidence for the general proposition stated in the diagrams stick> <stich, split> <splice,<sup>2</sup> but will

<sup>1</sup> I add to former examples given in the citations above such instances as ζαστήρι *πριαθείς* (= girdle pegged> bound, in Sophocles), and Od. 11, 228 (ap. AJP. 31, 421, fn. 2). In the language of magic, conversely, *καταδέω* (contrasting with Lat. defigo) is used of pegging down the tabellae defixionis (see Jevons in Anthropology and the Classics, p. 109).

<sup>2</sup> As regards this general semantic problem, cf. Eng. *clips*, defined in a pocket dictionary by "cuts with shears, curtains—embraces". On these definitions Stormonth remarks: "The two preceding entries [cuts, embraces] are connected in sense and etymology, because the ideas *clasp*ing, *grasp*ing and *cut*ting are clearly interchangeable, and derivable the one from the other". MEng. *girden* | *gurden* means (1) 'to enclose, bind round', (2) 'to strike, cut'.

proceed to exhibit particular instances, now by restudying the root *bhē(y)*- (AJP. 26. 179, 14) in some of its derivatives.

i *φί-λος*, *φί-λῦρα*, *φτ-μός*.

2. I would define *φί-λος* by quasi 'con-iunctus', cf. Skr. *bāndh-u-s* 'amicus, necessarius'.<sup>1</sup> Both the 'linden-tree' and the 'bast' derived therefrom—bast is found in the pile-dwellings, and was used as twine or cordage in that remote antiquity (see Schrader, *Reallex.* p. 841)—are designated by *φί-λῦρα* (*φιλύρα*) [tautological, quasi 'bind-strip', with *-λῦρα*: Lat. *lō-rum* 'thong', *lā-ra* 'strap' (Fay, AJP. 26, 172)].

The *φτ-μός* or 'muzzle-strap' also designated a bast-like material, I take it, and Aristophanes used *φιμόω* of tying a halter about a man's neck [cf. § 25, fn.]; cf. *fi-lum* 'thread', *fū-nis*<sup>2</sup> (*ū* from *oy*) 'rope', *felix/filix* 'fern' (named from its filaments), Germ. *bilsen* (Kraut), a plant used in exorcising (i. e. 'binding') evil spirits. The *φύλη*, a cooking pan in Homer, may have succeeded a woven or bark cooking vessel (cf. Ir. *rúsc* 'rinde; gefäss aus rinde, korb; cortex'; and see Walde, s. v. *cortina*). If Germ. *bil* meant 'lenis' (see Prellwitz, s. v. *φίλος*) the primary sense was 'flexible, pliable', and we may talk of a secondary root *bhi-l-*. But *bil-* seems rather first to have meant 'iustus' (cf. Paul, Wtbch., s. v. *billig*)—which belongs to Skr. *yāūti* 'binds' (vide auct. ap. Walde cit.). This explanation is also valid for *Weich-bild* 'Stadt-bezirk' or, as we say in English, 'bounds' or 'confines' of a town (cf. Lat. *fi-nes* 'bounds' ?)—unless *Weich-bild* first meant 'urbana iurisdictio'. Both these senses of *bil-* are found in Celtic, cf. Ir. *bil* 'good' (i. e. 'iustus') and *bil* (stem *bili-* or *bilio-*) 'rand' (i. e. 'border, binding, boundary' cf. xi below = § 28). All this amounts to pretty solid evidence for a stem *bhil-* quasi 'iunctum', cf. Skr. *yuktā-m*

<sup>1</sup> This reminds me that long ago, in a spirit not altogether of levity, I sought to explain Lat. *filia* by 'spinster' (Cl. Rev. 13, 400). It now seems to me seriously worth while to connect *filius* with *φίλος*, even at the cost of questioning the relation between *filius* and the Umbrian "sucking pigs" (*feliuf sif*). If the root was *bhē(y)*-, an Italic stem *feilio-* is quite allowable, whence Umbr. *fel.* (von Planta, no. 293. 2) = Lat. *fil<ius>*. Note the degradation of *bāndhu-s* in the Sanskrit compound 'brahmabandhū-s' 'Priestergeselle' (in a contemptuous sense), as in *bandhula-s* 'bastard' (v. on *νόθος*, AJP. 25. 380).

<sup>2</sup> The sept of Lith. *geinis* (see Walde, s. v.) is also available for comparison. In that case *φίλος* is abnormal (?) for \**θίλος*, but cf. *βίος*: Lat. *vivo*.

'passend', i. e. 'aptum, iustum', definitions which suit the German and Celtic adjectives, while for *φίλος* the sense of 'coniunctus' (cf. Skr. *bāndhu-s* 'amicus') is appropriate.<sup>1</sup>

3. The root *bhēy-* 'binden', extended by *dh*, appears further in Goth. *baidjan*: OBul. *bēditi* 'costringere' (i. e. 'to draw tight with cords', see Fay, op. cit., 179 and, for the kinship of Goth. *baidjan* with Skr. *bādh-ate* cf. Solmsen, KZ., 37, 24 fn.). Similarly Germ. *binden* means 'to constrain'. I also derive Ir. *cobeden cobodlas* 'coniunctio; manus' (cf. Fick, I<sup>4</sup>, p. 491) from the root *bhě(y)-dh-* 'iungere' (aliter Thurneysen, Gram., p. 457, where *cobodlus* is the form cited), and likewise *buden* 'manus' (start-form *bodīnā*, Fick-Stokes, p. 176), cf. Lat. *fib-ra* 'nervus', *fab-er* 'joiner'. In Skr. *bhī-s* 'angst, anxietas' (cf. *anxius*: *angit* 'schnürt') the sense of 'metus' has developed, cf. *bháyate* 'metuit': Lith. *bai-dý-li* 'to scare' [?: the root *sker-* 'caedere'], wherein *-dý-* is to be identified with the determinative syllables in *εσ-θι-ω* (?: *θειω*; cf. TAPA. 41, 29, fn.) and Lat. *au-di-o*, *con-di-o* (pace nonnullorum dixerim).

4. To be sure, we may more easily explain Skr. *bháyate* 'metuit' from the sense 'to strike'<sup>2</sup> as found in OBulg. *biti* 'schlagen', though it is not impossible, as I must add for semantic completeness, that the sense 'schlagen' has developed secondarily, after, if not from, 'binden'. Thus *bičī* 'whip', and other Slavic words meaning 'whip, rod, stake' might first have had the sense of 'withy, lash' whence, in the verb, ['to bind, lash,] beat', as in the Horatian *plectuntur Achivi*. But on the other hand, in locutions like "einen in fesseln schlagen", "schafe auf die weide schlagen", the connotation of 'binding, lashing' is found, and in the rope-maker's phrase "tau, reef schlagen" *schlagen* means 'to twine together'. Still I conclude that, in our root *bhēy-*, 'schlagen' was the more original meaning (see §§7, 11), though 'binden' was doubtless also proethnic.

<sup>1</sup> In the following excerpt from Hesiod (Fr. 157, 3-4), *ὄν τε πόδας χεῖράς τε δέει γλώσσαν τε νόον τε/δεσμοῖς ἀφράστοισι, φιλεῖ δέ ἐ [= τὸν πῖοντα] μαλθακὸς ἕπνος*, the sense of 'binds' may be read into *φιλεῖ*. This does not hurt the interpretation (cf. Tom Moore's "Ere slumber's chain hath bound me" with Aen. 2, 253), but is not warranted, of course, by word-history.

<sup>2</sup> The differentiation of strikes, beats, cuts, splits (all = chops) is unoriginal (see Fay, Cl. Quart. 1. 18, Mod. Lang. Notes 22, 38 fn., TAPA, 37, 8-9; and below, §7 fn. 2).

ii Eng. *bent*: Germ. *binse*.

5. The *bent* or *bent-grass* is "a coarse grass which creeps and roots rapidly through the soil by its wiry and jointed stems". The West Germanic startform is *binut*, which I further derive from \**bhi-nodu-s* quasi 'bind-weed', from *bhi-*: *bhēy-* 'binden' + *nodu-s*: *ne-d-* as reflected in OIr. *nenaid* and Eng. *nettle*. In Grimm's lexicon, s. v. *binse*, a sort of regret is expressed that *binse* cannot be reconciled with *binden* as Lat. *iuncus*<sup>1</sup> is (there) derived from *iungit*.—On Germ. *bi-nezzon*, see below (iv).

iii German *bast*: *binden*.

6. The cognation of these words lies deep seated in the German folk-consciousness, though we can no longer derive the noun from the verb as Grimm did, but I think I have a solution that will preserve the cognation at the expense of the derivation. I am going to suppose that the notandum in *bast* does not describe what bast is used for, but how it was obtained. For the technique employed nowadays in the production of the linden bast of commerce it is enough to refer to the German encyclopaedias, but I have been able to make minute inquiries of an artisan friend of mine who worked in his boyhood in the bast industry on the Russo-German frontier. The present process—with tools, it must be remembered, of a far different detailed shape and total potency to neolithic tools—does not suggest the etymology I have to present, but my informant told me of an Englishman who came to his village and unsuccessfully attempted to expedite the preparation of bast by a method of 'beating' the outer bark away from it. Preparation by beating is demonstrably the method—or at least a method—of obtaining bast followed not long ago by neolithic savages in the South Seas and in America.<sup>2</sup> And, in the native district of my friend, to get

<sup>1</sup> In *iūncus* I find a tautological compound; *iū-*: Skr. *yāśti* 'binds' + *nc*: Lat. *necessitas* 'quae vincit' (see Fay, TAPA. 37, 11 sq.), Goth. *nēhw* 'iuxta' (cf. Span. *junto* 'prope'), OIr. *éc-ess* 'poeta' (cf. for the meaning Perso-Skr. *bandin-* and Gr. *παψ-ψόδος*), *éc-en* 'necessitas'. Folk-Latin *iūncus* has *ū* from *iūnxi*, *iūunctus*. At least as long as a root *yoi-n-* 'nectere' is not otherwise proved I shall remain skeptical about the startform *yoini-(co)* inferred from *iūncus* and modern Irish *aoin*, especially in view of the proximity of the Anglo-French "root" *foi(g)n* 'iungere' (cf. TAPA. 41, 50).

<sup>2</sup> "Another kind of textile . . . is the result of beating out the bast or inner bark of certain trees. In Mexico, all over Central America, in the South

the bast of other trees than the linden, e. g. the willow, beating was the method employed. Not only bast, but flax has been found in the Swiss pile dwellings and doubtless the neolithic man reduced his flax to filaments by a process of beating similar to the present process.

7. I would accordingly derive Pre-Germ. *ba-s-tu-s* (on *-s-tu-*, see Brugmann, Gr<sup>1</sup>. II. 1, § 334) either from *\*bhā-s-tu-s* or *\*bho-s-tu-s* = 'quod caedendo paratur': *bhē(y)-*<sup>1</sup> extant in OBulg. *biti* 'caedere' (= schlagen)<sup>2</sup> and, as we have seen above, in *φί-λυπα* 'bast, linden'.

8. But how do we establish relation between *bhā-s-tu-s* 'caesum' and the root of *binden*, viz: *bhe-n(e)dh-* 'vincire'? I regard *bhe-* as nominal, quasi 'bast', while *-n(e)dh-* is the well known root meaning 'binden'; the complex = 'bast-bindet', cf. examples like Germ. *platzgreift*, Eng. *par[t]akes*.

9. This analysis of the "root" *bhen(e)dh-*, though new in detail, has been presented by me in substance before in an extended, however summary, analysis of the Indo-Iranian nasal verb-flexion (AJP., 25, 369-389; 26, 172-203, 377-408). This

American states . . . throughout equatorial Africa, in Oceanica . . . culminating in Hawaii, is to be seen a lacelike fabric with fibres intertwining like paper or felt, or in coarser fashion" (Mason, Woman's Share in Primitive Culture, p. 54). [Apropos of 'fabric' and 'fibres', as here used, see §3].

<sup>1</sup> There is no reason why Lat. *fascia* 'band, bundle' (cf. Brugmann, l. c., p. 478) and even *φάσκιλος* 'scrip, purse' do not also belong to this root, as well as Lat. *fiscus, fiscina, fiscella*, names of baskets made of rushes or twigs (the bast of willow twigs?), cf. Germ. *Binsenkorb*, and on *binse*, above).

<sup>2</sup> I must here recur to a point I have made in other connections (e. g. TAPA, 37, 9), viz.: that the further back we go in prehistory the less differentiated are the handicraft words, that 'caedit' (= beats-cuts-splits) retains in its lack of differentiation the habitude of whatever word was used by our neo-, or shall I say palaeo-, lithic ancestors to describe the activities of his stone tool of the *coup-de-poing* variety. Even now, when I 'chop' kindling with an ax, I 'split' or 'cut', 'strike' and 'break', all with the same tool, much what the primitive man did with the almond-shaped stone he wielded with his fist. Certainly one of his most important 'splittings' was addressed to the nucleus from which he would 'strike' or 'break' or even gently 'press' or 'rub' off a flint splinter. Tolerable evidence for 'rubs': 'splits' may be extracted from Germ. *reibt* 'rubs' [root, in a weak stage, *w)ri-bh-*]: Eng. *rives* [: Lat. *ripa*; root, in a weak stage, *ri-p-*]. The phonic elements of *w)ri-bh-* are also found in *sc-rib* it 'writes': *σκα-ῖφ-ἀεταί* 'scratches' (an outline), wherein we have a blend of the root *ri-bh-* with *sker-* 'caedere'. With *w)ri-bh-* cf. Eng. *writes* [root, *wri-d-*].

study in tautological composition<sup>1</sup> has been treated with the coldness of neglect, but a scholar as considerate as he is justly eminent was good enough to write me that he did not like "die Richtung". For myself, I do not like the tendency either, but neither do I dislike it. Nor is this a priggish pretence to set myself above liking and unliking. Personally I find the *-ne-* infix theory as now current altogether unreasonable, so unreasonable that I distinctly do not like it, and so I have offered a theory that does not offend my own reason<sup>1</sup> which, however it may be at fault, must be my ultimate rudder. The present analysis of *bhen(e)dh-* as 'bast-binden' is easier of acceptance, I realize, than the former analysis, which virtually defined by 'schlagen-binden'. But, alienating as 'schlagen-binden' may look at first sight, we virtually have it condensed in Eng. 'to rivet', if not in 'to clinch' (see other evidence in *AJP.* 26, p. 177, L; *TAPA.* 41, 35).

iv Germ. *binezson* 'inretire'; *beide*.

10. The analysis of *bhen(e)dh-* as 'bast-binden' is, *mut. mut.*, valid also for *bi-nezzon*, with *bi-* as in *φι-λupa* and *fi-scus* (§§ 2, 7, fn., cf. also *binse*, 5), and *-nezzon* to the root *ne-d(h)-* 'binden'. This analysis of *bi-nezzon* allows us to conceive of the possible origin of the preverb *bhĩ-* as found in the Latin tautological compound *ambi* (cf. Schulze, *lat. Eigenn.* 542, fn. 3) and its kin. I have sought before now the origin of the preverbs in tautological compounds, of Lat. *dē-*, e. g. (*Cl. Qt.* I. 26), and Germ.

<sup>1</sup>In an essay not yet published I have called attention to the Chinese tautological compounds (see Steintal-Misteli's *Abr. d. Sprachwiss.* II. 159 sq., especially 163). Similar compounds from Hungarian are cited by Wood (*Mod. Phil.* 9, 169) as follows: "*nval-fal* 'lick-devour', *ken-fen* 'smear-daub', *csusz-masz* 'creep-crawl', etc." Wood's copious lists of colloquial Germanic "iteratives" and blends form a welcome addition to our available store of examples. He anticipated in *Pub. MLA.* 14, 335 my derivation (*Cl. Rev.* 20, 254) of *dap-dáπτει* from *déπει + dáπτει*.

<sup>2</sup>As to the general question of method in semantics, the following words, though spoken in a different context, are instructive: "Malgré l'absence de moyens d'investigation, ce sont des problèmes qui, à quelque facile positivisme qu'on se résolve, reviennent se poser à l'esprit, mais restent malheureusement sans solution" (Brunot, *Hist. d. l. langue Française*, I, p. 52.). To which I (banally) add that the tentative solution of today may prove, or lead the way to, the accepted solution of the future.





had the sense of 'bast', and the nominal sense so acted upon the verbal as to give to *bhē(y)*- a derived sense of 'binden'. Can we doubt that Skr. *bhit-tis* 'mat or wall of split reeds' is ultimately of the same provenience? True, for *bhit-tis* we find it convenient to talk of a root *bheyd*- 'findere', and to conceive of it as *bhē(y)*- + a determinative *-d*-, but the semantic relation of *bhit-tis*: *bheyd*- can scarcely be different from the relation of *φί-λυρα* and *ba-st* to *bhē(y)*- 'caedere'. And could we prove *bhit-tis* to be of Indian provenience, we should still have to admit that the nominal sense of *bhit-tis* is reflected in *bhin-nās* 'coniunctus', *vyatibhinnas* "unzertrennlich verbunden mit". But where full word history fails us—as it often perplexingly will—there is no such thing as dating or localizing a semantic process,<sup>1</sup> and if *bhin-nās* 'coniunctus' originated late in the separate life of

<sup>1</sup> I am not sure that I understand the bearing of Kluge's remarks, s. v. *nähen*, to-wit: die sippe ist wohl durch vorhistorische entlehnung von einem volke zum andern gewandert so dass nähen kein echt germ. wort wäre. If this remark seeks to palliate the semantic difference between *nähen* 'suere' and *νέει* 'spins' I do not realize any advantage in assuming a temporary foreign sojourn for members of this word sept. To begin with, the *νέει* sept does not restrictedly signify 'spins' as *πέπλος τε νῆσαι* (Soph.) and *στήμονα νήσεις* (Aristophanes) show, but also goes further in describing the process of cloth making (cf. Meringer in Wch. Kl. Phil. 1910, 595, who furnishes a convenient formula for—I presume he does not fancy himself the first to have taken note of—the fact that a word may become allocated to describing a single or a further step in a complicated process). In Skr. *snāyati* the generalized sense of 'wraps, vestit' has advanced far beyond either 'sews' or 'spins' or 'weaves'. The original sense, even, as I have elsewhere noted, might have been 'sews' (from 'pricks', cf. AJP. 25, 376; for the stick-stitch-bind development also cf. *ῥάβδος* 'stick, switch (i. e. withe), rivet', *ῥαπίς* 'switch': *ῥάπτει* 'stitches', Lith. *verp-ti* 'nēre'). Because of the *νεῦρον-nervus* group, I start with the noun sense 'sinew' and in conformity with my motto of "cherchez le dénominatif" (TAPA, 37, 8) I assume 'to sinew' as the earliest verb sense. From work done with *sinews* developed in one direction the sense 'to baste' (= sew, i. e. use a bast-thread; cf. contrariwise 'to tack, prick, stitch' wherein the activity of the needle is indicated), and in a second the sense 'to spin' (cf. Fr. *filer*, denom. to Lat. *filum* 'thread'), and in still another 'to plait' (cf. OIr. *snám* 'flecto').—Though even if we start with 'spins' there is no reason to challenge the development to 'sews', for one has but to assume as an intermediary a process vaguely like modern 'darning', which is weaving with a needle, or 'knitting'. Should this seem a retrograde development one has but to recall the recent discussion (see Zupitza in Wch. Kl. Phil. 1910, 37-39) of how folk Latin *pī(n)sare* = 'to thresh' (cf. Plautine *flagro pinsare* = 'to flog with a whip or rod') is related to *pīnsere* = "to pound in a mortar"—a combination of sense attested also by *τρίβειν* and *terere*.

Sanskrit, whether under the influence of *bhittis* 'mat' or of *sambhinnas*—wherein the sense of conjunction is to be charged to *sam-* 'cum'—yet the nominal stem *bhēy-* 'bast' is not unlikely to have affected the "root" *bhēy-* 'caedere' at ever so remote a period, so that for us *bhēy-* has the two senses of 'caedere' and 'vincire' (i. e. 'suere').

vi Latin *fenestra*.

12. I formerly suggested the derivation of *fenestra* from *bhenedh-trā* 'hole, slot' (AJP. 26, 182), but if there was any Greek \**φανοστρα* quasi 'lighter, revealer', I should far prefer a historic to a prehistoric startform. Brugmann's startform \**bhenestra* (Gr<sup>2</sup>. II. 1, § 255) is complicated, i. e. an *-es*-stem extended by a *-tro*-stem. I recur to the startform *bhenedhtrā* and, as there is no evidence for the definition 'hole, slot', I define, in conformity with the "root" *bhen(e)dh-* 'bastbinden' (§ 9), by something like 'shutter', cf. Lat. *fenestra clatrata*, *clathri* 'lattice, grate'. In the English poets *lattice* and, to a less extent, *grate* distinctly connote 'window',<sup>1</sup> while *wicket* conversely connotes a 'lattice' or 'grating'.<sup>2</sup> In Latin, *claustra* sometimes naturally implies 'porta' or 'fores' or 'operculum', e. g. in Mart. 10, 28, 8, *ferrea perpetua claustra tuere sera*, Aen. 2, 259, *pineae furtim | laxat claustra Sinon*. In the glosses *claustra* is defined by 'portae' aut 'ser[r]aturae'. In Plautus it is the latticed window that is chiefly in evidence, cf. As. 132, *concludere in festram firmiter*, interpreted in the light of the *festra clatrata* of Mi. 379, and of the *iuncta fenestra* which barred out intrusive lovers (Horace, C. 1. 25; cf. Ov. Am. 1. 6. 17, where *inmitia claustra relaxa* applies to the door).<sup>3</sup> Allusion to double shutters is clear in Ov. Am. 1. 5. 3, *pars adaperita fuit, pars altera clausa fenestras*.

13. If we accept Brugmann's startform, to say nothing more of the complicated suffixation,<sup>4</sup> we have in *fenestra* a quite

<sup>1</sup> Among the Cretan finds of the last few years the representations of windows distinctly suggest gratings or lattices (see Encyc. Brit. 1, pl. IV, i.).

<sup>2</sup> I rather think *wicket* originally meant something like 'lattice', and is perhaps to be connected with *wicker*. A lumberman's *wicket* is a shelter made of boughs of trees.

<sup>3</sup> In the next verse *ia-nua* is the 'entry', not the 'door'.

<sup>4</sup> The suffixation of *ἀγκιστρον* also looks complicated. Assuming that the barbed fish-hook replaced a barbed fish-spear—and *ἀγκ-* certainly contributes the note of 'barb'—, (ᾠ)ιστρον: Lat. *caedit* 'strikes' may furnish the apparent suffix, cf. Eng. *striker* 'harpoon'. In the locution 'to strike a fish' *strike* means 'to get on the hook by a sort of jerk'.

isolated survival of the (secondary) root *bhen-* 'φαίνει' whereas *bhenedh-trā* 'lattice' belongs with *offendix* (root *bhendh-*) 'band'.

14. For the fact of windows in a quite early type of house I refer to the hut-urn with a large window pictured in Mannus, II, 24. Either *postes* or a *vestibulum* are indicated also on these urns.

15. With the words for 'door', also, there is question whether the notandum is 'opening' or 'shutter'. Hesychius defines *θυρίς* (allocated to 'window') by *ὅπῃ μικρά* (of the 'hole'), but adds, *θυρίδας* 'Ἀττικοὶ τὰς τῶν γραμματείων πτυχάς (καὶ διθύρον λέγουσιν, οὐ τρίθυρον, ἀλλὰ τρίπτυχον). As to *θύρα*, Lat. *fores* (stem *dhwor-o-*), I doubt not that the original sense was 'shutter', as it was for the other stem *wero-* in Umbr. *veris-co* 'apud portas'<sup>1</sup> (cf. n. plur. *veru*: OBulg. *vra-la-*, unless we divide *vrat-a* [: Lat. *vertit* = *valvae*; *volvit*—which is not to separate *wert-* 'vertere' from *wer-* 'tegere, defendere', but to suggest that the sense 'vertere' had its origin in the turning of a *\*wer-to-m* on its *cardo*]).<sup>2</sup>

vii English *bee* 'biene'; Lat. *apis*.

16. With the root *bhēy-* in its secondary sense of 'binden' I would also connect our word *bee*, the 'carpenter[bee]' to wit, in his function of builder or 'joiner', cf. also Lat. *apis* 'bee': *apere* 'iungere, vincere'.

viii Umbr. *kom-bifia-* 'nuntiare, mandare', pf.-stem *-bifia-ns-*; Lat. *iubeo, vincio*.

17. In this Umbrian compound we have the root *bheydh-* (i. e. *bhēy-* + *dh-*) found also in *πεῖθω* (cf. AJP. 26, 180) and in *fīb-ra*

<sup>1</sup> Plural, like *fores*. Perhaps *d-* for *dh-* in Skr. *dvdr-* is due, not to deaspiration in cases with *-bhyas*, etc., but to the influence of *dvd-* 'duo'.

<sup>2</sup> I will here add that proethnic *dhworo-* for which no etymology has been traced may be a complex in which the sound-picture of *woro-* has overlaid the sound-picture of *\*dhoro-*: *θώραξ* 'cuirass' (covering for the breast); Skr. *dhārikā* 'columna' (postis). The question arises whether *\*dhoro-* did not first describe the column of a door-way (cf. for the fact the hut-urn referred to in § 14 with its indicated 'portico'). [In Mexican cities the *portales* are porticoes in front of the shops, often located about the large public squares, and serving as booths for small merchandise. In many cases to go to the *portales* is to go to the public square. Was *forum* a collective designation in Italian towns for a mercantile colonnade similarly situated on one or more sides of a public square, like the *tabernae veteres* at Rome, say?—But the root of (supplanted) *\*dhoro-* 'shutter' is perhaps found in provincial English *dern/darn* 'to hide, to stop up a hole'.



was the earlier of the two forms. At any rate it is susceptible to a rather obvious analysis, viz.: as *de-lira-liquerit* in the sense of <servator avium> deliraverit. Then, as von Planta has already observed (Gram. II, p. 350, fn. 2), *-lins'* represents a Latin *\*linx(it)*, like *finxit*, *pinxit*, *strinxit*.

20. The only other Umbrian perfect in *-ns'* is found in the stem *purdins'* 'porrexit', for the formation of which I see no way to plead irradiation. I suspect that in *-dins'* we must recognize another sigmatic perfect to a stem *-dink-*, cognate with Lat. (*in-*)*dico*, and with *δείκνυμι* (*-dink-*: *δείκνυμι* = Lat. *iungit*: *ζεύγνυμι*).

ix Germ. *beil* and Lat. *findit*.

20. The accepted derivation of OHG. *bīhal* from *\*bhī-tlo-* 'schläger' seems to me not more probable than its analysis as *bhī-* (*bhāy-*) + a cognate of the posterius in *δί-κελλα* 'two-(pronged-) mattock'. With 'strike-mattock' cf. Ger. *beut-heie* "stosz-hammer".—What reason based on a sound principle for rejecting the analysis of Lat. *findo*: Skr. *bhinādmī* as *bhī-* quasi 'strike' + *-nāx-d-* 'secare' (tautological, see § 9, fn.) in OIr. *snaidim* 'seco', Welsh *naddu* 'asciare, dolare'? That this Celtic "root" *snad-* is cognate with *s)nē-* in Germ. *nähen* and *nadel*, I further believe, nor is there any reason to question this cognation if, as suggested above (§ 11, fn.), the root *snē-* had a primitive sense 'to prick' which gradually gave way to the specialized senses of 'to sew, darn(?), weave, wrap' (Skr. *snāyati*)—whence 'to cover, protect' (in OIr. *snādim* 'protego').

21. I would here add a general remark on the relation of meaning in English *split* and *splice*. The process of splicing has two chief moments, first to *split* or unravel two rope ends and second to *plait* or *intertwine* those *split* ends together, but to the word chosen to designate the entire process only *split* makes a linguistic (phonetic) contribution. Similarly in Lat. *immolare* the 'meal-besprinkling' (quasi 'mealing') has come to designate the general act of 'sacrificing' [cf. also Skr. *badhnāti* "fesseln (bes. ein opfertier), darbringen, schlachten"; further illustrations in *γυνάσσομαι* and *supplico*, and in *ἀποπαρῶ*].<sup>1</sup> Now there was one neolithic process in which 'splitting' was the first act in a process of 'binding', the very important process of securing a tool or

<sup>1</sup> Extension of meaning to cover a further stage in an act involving several steps might be designated as 'sequel' or 'serial' meaning.

weapon to its handle. Here the handle must be 'split' or 'grooved' or 'notched' for the insertion of the implement which was then <gummed and> 'tied' securely with cords, sinews or the like. In extensions of the root *bhṣy-* 'schlagen' we find the virtual sense of 'splicing' (as in Skr. *bhit-tis*; see § 11), as well as of 'splitting' (as in Lat. *findit*). Who is to show us that Lat. *fid-es* (plur.) 'strings' means rather 'splitters' (= something split off) than 'binders'? Cf. also *πεῖσμα* 'rope', which is as likely to come from \**πειθσμα* 'split, thong, lash' as from \**πενθσμα* 'band, binder'.

x Skr. *bhiṣāj-*.

22. In the analysis as *bhiṣ-āj-* 'demon-driving' (cf. RV. 10, 97, 6 where a leech is called "fiend-slayer, chaser of disease") or 'angst-treibend' (AJP. 26, 399) I have come as near the truth as the Indo-Iranian usage of this word will ever warrant, I believe. The analysis as *bhi-ṣaj-* 'splint-binding' (cf. RV. 9, 112, 1; 10, 39, 3, where the leech looks after wounds and broken bones; also, for the cure of wounds, cf. 8, 22, 10; 8, 61, 17; 8, 68, 2) is also possible, with *bhi-* as in the *findit*-sept and *saj-* = the Sanskrit root meaning 'heften': Lith. *seg-ti* 'heften'. Here there is a difficulty, for we must apparently write the posterius for the Indo-Iranian group as *-seg*, while *seg-ti* has either *g* or *g<sup>w</sup>*. Still the alternation of palatal and pure guttural lacks not for parallels.

23. If this provisional explanation of *bhi-ṣāj-* should haply be true, it may be confirmed by the testimony of *ἀκέομαι*. Chronologically *ἀκέομαι* seems first to mean 'curo, medeor' and second 'sarcio'. I would reverse this arrangement and start with quasi *sarcio*, cf. E 401, *φάρμακα πάσσων | ἡκέσατ* = applying salves he bound-up <the wound>, II 523, *τόδε καρτερὸν ἔλκος ἀκεσσαι* = hoc grave vulnus liga. For the development of the sense of 'heals' from 'binds up' observe how, in our authorized version, "to bind up the broken-hearted" (Isaiah 61. 1) has become in Luke 4. 18 "to heal the broken-hearted". The root of *ἀκέομαι* is the root of *acus* 'needle', but the sense has derived from 'pricks' (see § 11, fn. 1).

24. We can hardly refuse to admit that the binding up of broken bones was within the skill of the prehistoric medical man and as he could neatly trepan the skull, his skill to stitch wounds with sinews may well be taken for granted.

25. The paragraphs on Skr. *bhiṣḍj-* and Gr. ἀέομαι were lying complete on my desk more than a month before the issue of Brugmann's discussion of these words in IF. 28, 285 seq. In view of that discussion it becomes necessary to make some additions to my previous brief statements. That in *bhi-ṣḍj-* *bhi-* means 'bast'<sup>1</sup> and is not the preposition *abhi* with apocope is perhaps proved by *bheṣajá-* 'medicamentum', for neither secondary gradation nor an old alternation of the preverb *bhi-* with *bhaxy-* seems to me at all plausible. In Avestan, only the diphthongal forms are of record. If we write *bhaxy-saxḡó-* 'bast-binding' as a startform (*bhaxy-*: the root *bhēy-* :: Skr. *re-* [in revánt-]; *rāi-* 'res') the further reduction in *bhi-sáxḡ-* is entirely normal for noun-stems. Brugmann has rejected the ascription of the posterius in *bhi-sáj-* to the word-sept to which Lith. *segù* | *segiu* 'ich hefte, schnalle' belongs, and has connected it with Lat. *sāga* 'seer, witch', which is very attractive at first glance. But the root *sāg-* is, in my opinion a compound root, from *s(w)-* 'co-' (see TAPA. 41, 31) + *aḡ-* 'agere' (cf. Lokr. ἄγω), and meant 'cogere; cogitare', senses which account not only for ἀέομαι and Germ. *suchen*, but for such special nuances as *sagax* 'nasutus' (of a hunting dog), cf. ἡγεμών 'dux', i. e. 'co-actor'; thus *praesagire* = 'prae-cogitare'. Or does *sāga* mean 'quae defigit', v. Ovid, Am. 3, 7, 29, ap. Jevons, l. c., p. 115.

26. Is Brugmann's phonetic objection to the association of *-saj-* with Lith. *segù* conclusive? It arises from the conflict between the *g* of Lithuanian and the *z* of Av. *bažaza-*, and he disposes of the testimony of the *k* of *bhiṣḍák* (nom.) *bhiṣḍákti* (3d sg.) by calling the *k* secondary. But suppose the *z* of Avestan is secondary? And why should it not be? I need not discuss afresh the question of the derivation of palatals from (pure) gutturals in the proethnic speech, for the principles have already been laid down correctly by J. Schmidt in KZ. 25, 123 sq., and rediscovered about twenty years later by Hirt (BB. 24, 288), viz.: that what we will call the plain guttural series *k, g,*, etc., suffered a change in a palatal environment<sup>2</sup> to what

<sup>1</sup> On the island of Cyprus *φιμόω* (v. § 2) and *φιμοτικός* are used to describe the 'binding' of exorcism (Jevons, Anthropol. and the classics, p. 116).

<sup>2</sup> This is, in substance, the view of J. Schmidt, but Hirt, who cannot bring himself away from the idea that, as *é* alternates with *o*, the *o* is derived from the *é* (see also his Gr. Gram., § 92 Anm.), thinks that *kvo* is involved in *kve*

may be best designated graphically by *ky*, *gy*, etc. Then in one and the same paradigm or word-sept there was alternation of *g* with *gy*, with a tendency toward a final victory of only one of the alternatives. Let us apply these theoretical considerations to our word-sept. In Lithuanian we have the alternation between *segù* (o/e verb) and *segiù* (yo/e verb); in Sanskrit, we have *bheṣaj-á-s*, but also *bheṣaj-yá-s*, *bhiṣákti*, but also *bhiṣaj-yáti*; cf. also, with intransitive value, *sájati* 'haftet' (ptc. *saktá-s* 'attached to'); in Avestan, as it would appear from Bartholomae's lexicon, *baēšaz(a)-* and *baēšazy(a)-* are almost equally common, whether in verb or noun form. Proethnically there must have been an alternative of *g* with *g'y* in kindred forms of this sept, and even in the same noun paradigm conflict between *-go-* and *-gye-* in the flexion. In Avestan this conflict was resolved in favor of *gye* (*g'e*), but in Lithuanian and Sanskrit in favor of *-go-*.<sup>1</sup> If not, why not? Did not Greek resolve the conflict between *λείπω* and *\*λείρεis*<sup>2</sup> in favor of the former, and Latin the conflict between *ecus secuntur* and *equi* (plur.) *sequitur* in favor of the latter? So far as Sanskrit is concerned, *gy* (*g'*) is attested, to the best of my knowledge, only when *ṣt* stands as the product of *gt* > *ḱt*,<sup>3</sup> which may be interpreted to mean that *kt* yielded *kyt* (or *ḱt*) proethnically in this series. These facts may be represented as follows, with modifications of J. Schmidt's table (op. cit., p. 123):

Proethnic.		Sanskrit.	
II a)	$\kappa \quad \gamma \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} <\gamma't> \\ <\gamma't> \end{array} \right.$	k, c	$<(g) j> \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ṣt}^4 \\ \text{j (g)} \end{array} \right.$
b)	$\kappa' \quad \gamma' \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} <\gamma't> \\ <\gamma't> \end{array} \right.$	ç	$j (g) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ṣt} \\ \text{ṣt} \end{array} \right.$

it is not anymore than *ecos* is involved in *equi*. Hirt's most certain result lies in the correlation of the suffix *-go-* (i. e. *ko*) with *ḱo-* (i. e. *kyo*), as in Skr. *lopā-ṣds/lopā-ka-s* 'fox' (v. p. 288), which can be due to no other cause than a levelling as between *kye* and *ko*, no matter which was the prior consonantism.

<sup>1</sup> On the general question of the divergent treatment of "ḡ" in Sanskrit and Avestan see Leonard Bloomfield in AJP. 32, p. 52, § 21.

<sup>2</sup> See a recent discussion of the conflict of *κ* and *π* forms of the interrogative in early Ionic in AJP. 32, 74 sq.

<sup>3</sup> This is to regard the *ṣt* of *bhrdṣtra-* 'roasting-pan' as the genuine phonetic continuant of *gt*; cf. the pure guttural in OPruss. *-birgo* 'cook'.

<sup>4</sup> Where *kt* appears it is due to the mediation of the *j* (*g*) forms common to the velar and pure guttural series.



Avestan.			Old Bulgarian.		
<k, č> s	<g (j)> z	{ ? <št> <št>	<k> s	<g> z	{ ? <st> <sup>1</sup> <st>

27. Brugmann's derivation of ἀκέομαι from  $\eta + \kappa\epsilon\sigma$  (: κεύζω) used of the 'incutting' of the surgeon is semantically neither more nor less likely than my own definition from the surgeon's 'stitching'. Is stitching what the word came to mean [cf. ἀκεσται, of 'menders' (of torn garments), and Aristotle used it of a spider mending her net], or what it originally meant? The Homeric usage is as follows: (1), of healing wounds Ε 448, Π 29, 523; Ε 402 (901) by application of salves; (2), of healing mental hurts Δ 36, I 507, N 115 (bis); γ 145, κ 69 (very general); (3) of patching up (or caulking) damaged boats ξ 383; (4), of quenching thirst χ 2; (5), ἄκος, as a general remedy for ills, I 250, and of sulphur as a purificatio against defilement, χ 481. So far as the Homeric usage admits of inference, the dressing and bandaging, if not stitching, of the surgeon and not his cutting must be thought of. There is neither semantic nor morphological obstacle in the way of recognizing a noun-stem \*ἀκες—'stitch' (lit. 'puncture, prick of a needle'), cognate with Lat. *acus* 'needle' (from 'pricker'), as the source of a denominative \*ἀκεσ-υε-ται (cf. ἀκεόμενος). In surviving ἄκος 'remedium',<sup>2</sup> we have, for the sense, at least, a deverbative, like Lat. *pugna*. The proper name Ἀκοή (v. Keil ap. Brugmann, op. cit., p. 289) is formed like Lat. *opera*: *opus*. If Homer does not specifically mention the stitching of wounds, the Egyptian development of medicine took place long before the transmission of the art to pre-Homeric

<sup>1</sup> Of late years Skr. *dgra-m* has, on account of Av. *ayra-* (γ not z), been separated from the root *aj-* (Av. *az-*) 'agere'. But the definition as "das vorausgehende, und in diesem sinne (aber auch nur in diesem) die spitze" (Grassmann, Wtbch. z. R. V.) is not unsatisfying (cf. ἀγός 'leader'). This derivation may be maintained intact by supposing that \**agro-* was the proper phonetic form, and that it alternated with \**aḡeti* (with "g") securing, however, a certain semantic independence as \**aḡeti* became restricted in the Iranian branch rather to the sense of 'drive'. Then in an apparently isolated word like Av. *vazra-* 'fustis' (: Skr. *vājra-s* 'fulmen') the *z* is due to popular (but mistaken) association with *vaz-* 'vehere' (cf. *vectis* 'crow-bar, [= brechstange] handspike'), while Skr. *vājra-s* would owe its *j* (not *g*) to *vājdyati* 'calcaribus concitat, stimulat, instigat'. The root is also found in Lat. *vegeo* which need not for any semantic reason be separated from *augeo* (pace Walde s. v.), especially if Av. *vazra-* 'cudgel' has a secondary *z*.

<sup>2</sup> In apposition with ἐμμοτον 'lint' in Aesch. Choe. 471.

Greece. In so conservative an art it is something that Celsus (v. 26. 23) tells us of the stitching up of wounds with *acia* 'thread' (see Otto's Sprichwörter, s. v. *acus* for the proverbial use of *acus et acia*).

xi Eng. *bound, boundary*.

28. For Eng. *bound* a Celto-Latin *\*bodīnā* is the probable startform. This is identical, as Thurneysen has suggested, with the startform whence comes OIr. *buden* 'band' (= company of soldiers, see § 3). The development of sense seems to me most simple. Any *band* that formed the 'trimming, border, binding' of a garment, or any rope that defined the ring of a game or combat, constituted a 'binding, bound, boundary'. This is all concretely attested in the English word *list* 'border-stripe; boundary' which, as I may remark in passing, has probably given rise to the "excrement" *t* of *lists* = Mid. Fr. *lisse*—as the "excrement" *d* of *bound* = OFr. *bonne* may be due to a reinforcement from Eng. *bound* (ptc. to *binds*). Generally comparable is *ίμάς* 'band, thong, strap': Skr. *śimānta-s*, *śimān-* 'Markung eines Dorfes'.

xii φοιτάω.

29. Brugmann's article referred to in paragraph 25 would support the gradation (*a*)*bhi*: *bhei-* by deriving φοιτάω from φοι + ιταω. If one must find *'bhi-* in Greek I would recommend him to operate with the Aristophanic future *φιαλῶ* 'incipiam', unless the word *ἐφιάλτης* 'night-mare, incubo' (with the byforms *ἐπιάλτης ἐπιάλος*) so clearly revealed derivation from *e*)*pi* + *sal-* (: Lat. *salit* 'leaps'). So Norden, ad Aen. 6, 570, connects *Ἐφιάλτης* with *ἐφάλλεται*. Thus *φιαλῶ* (with *φιαλ* from *πιθαλ-*) means *in-siliam* > *in-cipiam*.

30. An etymology of φοιτάω, to be satisfactory, must account for the picturesque or graphic quality of this word,<sup>1</sup> such moments as Liddell and Scott have tried to render by 'to stalk about, strut about, roam <rage, rave> about', cf. φοιτάλεος 'furens' = παράκοπος—in Hesychius who also glosses φοίτης by ὁ κήρυξ. I would therefore derive φοιτάω directly from the root *bhěy-*, or rather from a noun-stem *bhěyto-* (? φοίτης) meaning originally

<sup>1</sup> Reference may be made here to the preface of the Petersburg Lexicon wherein Bōhtlingk and Roth especially deprecate the number of verbs that the commentators had defined by a colorless 'ire' or 'venire' (I, p. vi).

'beater'. I think particularly of a huntsman beating the woods. From the notion of 'beating' several contexts gain in point, e. g. β 182, ὄρνιθες . . . φοιτῶσι, of birds beating the air, γ 449, ἀν' ὄμιλον ἐφοῖτα θηρὶ εἰκώς, of Atrides, beating up <and down> his host like a wild beast at bay, η 760, φοῖτα ἀνὰ προμάχους διζήμενος εἴ που ἐφεύροι, of one beating up <and down> the battle line in search for a particular enemy, cf. Lys. 3, 29, ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμὴν οἰκίαν φοιτῶν εἰσέει βίῃ, where φοιτῶν, interpreted as from *bhē(y)*-, suggests Lat. 'pultans'.

31. On the general problem of the development of verbs of motion from the sense of 'striking' see AJP. 26, 198, especially noting M. Eng. *swappen* = 'to strike; go quickly'. So Eng. *strikes* and Germ. *streicht* (also reflexive) developed into verbs of motion—I say developed because I think they are plainly in error who reverse this semantic development (see also on ἐλαύνει, AJP. 26, 199). For φοιτάω of sexual activities (Ξ 296), cf. Eng. *striker* and Germ. *streichen* (in Huntsman's language) of the rutting of animals. With the use of *streichen* = *migrare* (of birds), cf. β 182, above. In the renderings above, to *beat* the woods, to *beat* up and down (for prey), said also of a stag at bay (cf. γ 449), to *beat* wing (β 182) have been already implied. To these may be added to *beat* up recruits (? or is this for 'drumming' up), and to *beat* a painful way. Bearing in mind the origin of φοιτάω in the chase we may ask if Lat. *ambire* = 'petere' (cf. *ambio ambiunt*, with *i*, not *e*) is not from *am[bhī]*- + *bhēy*-. Another cognate of φοιτάω would be *-bito*, with a by-form *beto* that exhibits dialectic *e* from a diphthong. Of course *b-* arose in a compound, not in the simplex.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.